

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Claims 19 through 98 are pending in this application. Claims 19 through 43 have been allowed. The specification been amended to correct reference number '94' to '44' for the base in paragraph [088]. Claim 38 has been amended to include a semicolon after the word "surface" for proper form. The first occurrence of the phrase 'wherein said' has been deleted from claim 20 to correct the informality objected to by the examiner.

Claims 44 through 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement in that the specification appears to only support the placement of the retaining members on the nozzle assembly. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. First, it should be noted that 'retaining members' are not elements of claims 69 through 72, and 'nozzle assembly' is not an element of claims 69 through 79. Nevertheless, applicant has amended these claims in order to overcome the rejection. Specifically, claims 44 through 52 and 61 through 68 have been amended to claim 'a first retaining member operatively associated with said nozzle part and said base part to removably attach said nozzle part to said base part'. Claims 53 through 60 have been amended to claim 'at least a pair of retaining members operatively associated with said nozzle part and said base part to removably attach said nozzle part to said base part'. Claims 69 through 72 have been amended to claim 'a slide latch operatively associated with said base part and said part of said recovery system to removably attach said part of said recovery system to said base part'. Claims 73 through 79 have been amended to claim 'retaining members operatively associated with

said front piece and said base part to removably attach said front piece to said base part'. Support for this subject matter in the specification is at least found on page 12, line 13 to 21, which states:

"When connecting the nozzle assembly 62 (FIG. 2B) to the frame 52, each slide latch 110 is first slid outwardly until the hook 116 engages the stop member 118 as best illustrated in FIG. 8A. The nozzle assembly 62 is then positioned so that the spacer 104 is aligned with the grommet 108 as previously mentioned. As seen in FIG. 8B, each latch 110 is then slid inwardly so that the tongue member 112 extends partially through a lateral channel 130 formed in the frame 52. As the slide latch 110 is slid further, the hook 116 cams against a beveled channel rib 132 on the top wall 133 of the channel 130, deflecting upwardly over the channel rib 132 and catching it as shown in FIG. 8C."

Applicant further submits that at least Figures 1, 2B, 4, 8A-C, and 9A-B of the specification disclose this subject matter too. Therefore this rejection should be overcome. The current amendment also removes the unnecessary limitations that the 'first retaining member is provided on said upper portion of one of said nozzle assembly and said base' for claims 44 through 52 and 61 through 68, that the 'at least a pair of retaining members provided on said upper portion of one of said nozzle assembly and said base' for claims 53 through 60, that the 'slide latch slidingly mounted to said upper portion of one of said base and said part' for claims 69 through 72, and that the 'at least a pair of retaining members provided on said upper portion of one of said front piece and said base' for claims 73 through 79.

Claims 44 through 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement in that it is unclear as to where in the specification it is disclosed that the 'nozzle assembly having a greater transverse distance than its longitudinal distance'. Applicant first notes that only claims 44 through 52 and 76 ('front piece' is claimed instead of 'nozzle part') include this claim language. Thus, claims 53 through 75 and 77

through 79 should not be rejected under this argument. With respect to claims 44 through 52, applicant has amended these claims for better clarity by stating instead that the 'nozzle part having a front end, a rear end, and side ends, wherein the distance between the side ends is greater than the distance between the front and rear ends'. With respect to claim 76, applicant has amended this claim for better clarity by stating instead that the 'front piece has a front end, a rear end, and side ends, wherein the distance between the side ends is greater than the distance between the front and rear ends'. Applicant further submits that at least Figures 2B, 3 and 6 of the specification disclose this subject matter and therefore overcomes this rejection.

Claims 44 through 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as to the clarity of the phrase 'being accessible from said outer surface of said upper portion'. Applicant has amended these claims for better clarity by substituting the phrase 'being accessible from the top of the floor cleaning device' for that phrase to overcome this rejection.

Claim 50 has been amended by substituting 'second' for 'first' at the appropriate lines as suggested by the examiner. Claims 51 and 68 have been amended by substituting 'retaining' for 'engaging' for proper antecedent basis.

Claims 52 and 61 have been amended by substituting 'base part' for 'main body' for proper antecedent basis. Claim 61 has been amended by substituting 'the surface' for 'a surface' at the appropriate line. Claim 73 has been amended by claiming that the 'front piece being at least partially translucent and positioned with respect to said brush assembly for viewing at least a portion of said brush assembly' in order to provide clarity to what is meant by 'for viewing at least a portion of said brush assembly'. Claim 76 has

been amended to depend from claim 73 instead of 75 to overcome the rejection that claim 77, which depends from claim 76, provides a limitation that was already provided in claim 75. Claim 78 has been amend to include the word 'said' after 'wherein'. These amendments to claims 50, 51, 52, 61, 68, 73, 76 and 78 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicant has also substitute 'nozzle part' for 'nozzle assembly' in claims 44 through 68 and 'base part' for 'base' in claims 44 through 79. Claims 48, 57, 59, 71, 75, 77 and 78 have been amended for better form. It is therefore believed that claims 44 through 79 should be allowed.

Claims 80 through 98 have been added in this application, which distinguish over the prior art of record and therefore should be allowed. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFERY A. MORGAN ET. AL.

By: Brett A. Schenck

Brett A. Schenck  
Reg. No. 35,347

Brett A. Schenck

THE HOOVER COMPANY  
Patent Department  
101 East Maple Street  
North Canton, OH 44720

Phone: (330) 499-9200, Ext. 2515